

ARIZONA HISTORICAL ADVISORY COMMISSION

March 22, 2007
MINUTES

The Arizona Historical Advisory Commission (AHAC) met at 1:30 pm. on March 22, 2007 at the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records, in the Director's Office Conference Room, at 1700 W. Washington, Suite 200, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

Full transcript available if needed.

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present

Jim Garrison, State Historic Preservation
Officer State Historic Preservation Office,
Arizona State Parks

Beth Vershure, Station Manager, KAET-
TV Channel 8
Arizona State University

GladysAnn Wells, Director
Arizona State Library, Archives and Public
Records

Ann Dutton Ewbank, Representative
Arizona Library Association

Melodee Jackson, Director, Constituent
Service Office of the Governor

Jay Zieman, Asst. Director
Arizona State Parks

John Driggs, Chairman
Phoenix Heritage Commission

Paul Allvin
Interim V.P. to External Relations at the
Univ of Arizona

Julie Yoder, Executive Director
Arizona Humanities Council

Steve Tully
Gordon & Rees, LLP

Catherine May, Senior Historical
Analyst/Archivist Salt River Project

Steve Rizley, Vice President & Region
Manager – Arizona Cox Communications

Noel J. Stowe, Chair/Professor of History
Arizona State University

Jean Calhoun, Director of Land and Water
Conservation
The Nature Conservancy

Members Absent

Anne Woosley, Executive Director
Arizona Historical Society

Hartman Lomawaima, Director
Arizona State Museum

Robert Booker, Executive Director
Arizona Commission on the Arts

Ken Travous, Director,
Arizona State Parks

Ken Bennett

Don Ryden
Ryden Architects

Guests

Steve Gervais – Pinnacle West
Wellington Reiter – ASU College of
Design

Darren Petrucci – ASU College of Design
John Saccoman – Capitol Weed & Seed
Coalition

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Jim Garrison called the meeting to order at 1:40 pm.

INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Garrison asked all members present to introduce themselves along with all guests.
(See above attendance)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Correction of January 30, 2007 – Jay Ziemann motioned to accept the minutes of the December 19, 2006 and Catherine May second the motion.

Correction of typo of January 30, 2007 – “GladysAnn Wells asked Noel, has he had a chance” not “have he’s had a chance”

Motion: Catherine May motioned to accept the corrected minutes of the January 30, 2007 meeting. Noel Stowe seconded the motion.

The motion passed to approve the corrected minutes of the January 30, 2007 AHAC meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Centennial Logo/Letterhead – GladysAnn informed everyone that the Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records will be going with a different telephone and internet provider. The phone number for Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records will be changing July 1, 2007. She asked if we should wait for the new phone number before printing the AHAC Letterhead or if we should just take off the phone number?

Steve Tully suggested we take off the phone number and print it in the macro before printing since we need a phone number on the letterhead.

GladysAnn said if there were no objections we will place the order for the letterhead etc.

Capitol Mall Update – Steve Gervais with Clinical West represented Phoenix Community Alliance which is an organization that promotes businesses within the central Phoenix area was present at the meeting to update the Commission on the Capitol Mall and Capitol Mall Redevelopment. Here is his update in full:

I’m here to update you on the Capitol Mall and the Capitol Mall redevelopment. If you remember about a year ago, in fact it was a little over a year ago when I went before this group and showed you this study here that we had just recently completed. This study was

completed at the end of 2005 was a study of two studios run through the college of design at ASU. The students produced the materials here which were basically to go back and look at the Capitol Mall District. You have a map in front of you with updated language which we'll get to in a minute. The Capitol Mall District is from 7th avenue to Van Buren on the north side of the railroad tracks facing the end of the south side and 19th avenue which is basically on the Westside. I say basically because if you go beyond the borders into the neighborhoods that extend beyond those borders into the downtown areas, you can see the connection with what's going on in downtown Phoenix and with what's going on west of 19th which is your Archives building. In that studio, this work was completed in 2005. What we indicated once we got this work done was that we were going to go back and look at the master plan for development of this Capitol Mall District. That master plan had not been changed in years, so it was time to go back and revisit the master plan and update that plan. Based on what the students had recommended and also the work that Dean Reiter and Darren Petrucci, what their recommending as planners from the College of Design of what we can do to make this Capitol in this Capitol Mall District a point of pride for us here in the State of Arizona. We are the largest capitol city in America and that's a fact. From my informal surveys across the United States and from talking to a lot of people, we probably have the least desirable capitol facilities in America; so it's time to change. When this state was founded and we're going to be celebrating the centennial which this Commission is very involved in as we'll be. In trying to enhance this capitol and these facilities and the buildings that make up the government complex, there's something that we need to get done. In 1912 when our founding fathers organized this and in 1906 when the original capitol was open, they thought that the capitol was too much. How can we afford to do this in 1906? So much so that they value engineered the stairs out of the building. They looked at the building and said that we have to cut back, we can't spend this much money. Then as we move forward in the history, as this evolved, there was additions made in the fifties. They decided that we've outgrown our space and we need to add some new legislative Houses, the House and the Senate; the current buildings that you see there. Most people would say here forty five-forty seven years later tear them down. We're not sure if that's the right way to go but their saying that in forty-seven to fifty years that a building becomes not useful and that it's served its time and purposes. At that point in time they said that we can't afford to expand, we've got to do with what we have but somehow they saw clear that the people who were involved legislative leadership and governing at the time had to add those buildings. Now it's been forty something years and we still have the same facilities but this state has quadrupled in size. We have many more people living here, more elected officials in our government, more services that we need to provide and we're here to say that now is the time. It was two weeks ago when we went in front of the legislative government of all Commissions which has authority to basically approve the monuments and Wesley Bolin Plaza. They also have authority above that to approve plans of any buildings that are going to be built in this Capitol Mall District. They formed a subcommittee that's chaired by Senator Flake. They adopted at that meeting a resolution to build a new capitol building and to cut the ribbon for the new capitol building at the centennial of February 14, 2012. I think that's a big goal but it's achievable, that's five years from now that we could be doing that. When we say cut the ribbon on a new Capitol building, we're talking about and maybe some of you saw this article that was in last weeks Capitol Times. This is a grand capitol, so when you're driving down Washington with your relatives and out of town visitors here to Arizona, your driving up and saying Wow that's a grand place. This is what we want to achieve and accomplish by the Centennial. My background is in development and this plan is a twenty-year plan but we need a plan to start from so that we can identify with the partners who are listed here. We met with everybody including GladysAnn to get input as to how we could make this a better place; what need's no

be done so that this is a place of pride? One of the things that we will do is complete an application for submitting the development of a new Capitol Complex as a centennial memorial project. I'm going to call Darren Petrucci up and Darren is a director from the College of Design. He'll walk you through the plan which will take about fifteen to twenty minutes and then he'll be glad to answer any of your questions at that point in time. Darren?

Petrucci: In front of you is this master plan drawing that we have done. In fact, I'm going to take you through the steps on how we got to this and then we're going to show you three different schemes on how one might add to the legislative facilities in the Capitol District. Steve said that we met with each of these organizations. This plan is not behind closed doors, this is a very pragmatic plan that we took into consideration with all the different organizations needs and desires. We looked at what the administration is looking at relative to obsolete buildings, buildings that are not structured well, buildings that are optimized as the best use, etc. What we're going to present to you is not a diagram or an illustration but really a working document that we've developed based on the existing conditions and the hopes of this project. Steve said that Phoenix is both the largest capitol city in the country and in Arizona. Symbolically, it represents the state and its aspirations. Functionally, it accommodates the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government. Because of it's proximity to downtown, the Capitol Mall's is poised for an inclusive revitalization. This is different than what we would normally think about the Capitol area's in major metropolitan areas. The intention here is how do we make it more inclusive to the revitalization of downtown? This is a very young state relatively speaking and with the Centennial coming up, this is an example of a leap frog into the 21st century. The Centennial plan was developed to achieve that hole and unlike many capitols as I've said which were previously isolated and undivided. This is the question of a series of one sustainable type of infrastructures and I'll talk about those in a minute. Public spaces and services that are more accessible to the public. Enhance the efficiency of the complex and facilitate more effective governments. This is a very important issue and as we know right now with the House and Senate, their disconnected. The House building clearly is not large enough for the members and for the activities that occur in that building. We really have a not so well situation of not only of the facilities but of the inability for these two groups to have any kind of let's say water cooler conversation in any capacity. And also an identity for a world class capitol community, how can we really project as Steve was talking about, a symbolic identity for the largest city with a state capitol in the United States. What is the image of that and what could it be? So to begin here, in this drawing, this is the Capitol Mall District that's outlined as you can see on the back. This drawing is shown to identify these lines around the edges as all of the public open spaces in this particular area that we've sort of core sampled. You can see the Pioneer Cemetery, Encanto Park, etc. What you find in the Capitol Mall District is what we're going to call the Capitol Pedestrian Campus: Pioneer Cemetery, University Park and the Carnegie Library. You've got a series of spaces in here that really within the one district make up a fairly significant portion of the number of public spaces in the city right now; so that's not something that's insignificant. In a sense the Capitol Mall District is really in many ways as once could look at it a core sample of the entire city and I'll explain what we mean by that in a minute. This is the legal definition of what we're calling the Capitol Mall District: Van Buren, 7th Avenue, 19th Avenue, and if you look down here at the railroad edges on the bottom. What do I mean as this being a core sample of the city? The analogy I am using is to compare it to a Whitman Chocolate box. It's a Whitman sampler of various organizations, public, private, governmental, etc. And so the first is our Capitol Core, the second is what we're calling the governmental campus, these are government owned lands. ADOT Campus is at the bottom, the expansion of the County Campus is currently to the east, this area that

their planning the expansion. The Human Services Campus, this is an example of let's say some of the first investment into this Capitol area. The Woodland Historic Neighborhood, this is really within the limit of the Capitol Mall area and is the only housing in this area; particularly a single attached old historic neighborhood. We have Pioneer Cemetery, Grace Court Development, University Park, Capitol Elementary School and what the rest of this represents is privately owned lands that we in the master plan are not being so presumptuous to imagine what would happen there. Some of the plans with the white and grey areas are areas that are privately owned. So these areas basically represent an interesting combination of private, county, governmental, neighborhood and city infrastructures such as parks and elementary schools, etc. It's interesting to think that we have this interesting cross-section within this area itself. One of the challenges we have though is that there's really not much connectivity between these various entities and we're talking about integrating a plan to connect these things in some capacity. Now some of these things we may not want to connect directly like the Human Services Campus but if you would think about how we might connect these various pieces of chocolate in the box. This is a drawing of the existing streets in the Capitol Mall area and I show this so that you can get an understanding of where the automobile circulation and alley ways are. In our proposal, we're proposing that this loop here go away and then 17th go away and here is the plan with street revitalization. Down Washington we have the Flag Walk and you can see the little dots of the flags. We have on Jefferson the re-landscaped automobile street moving from west to east. Adams will reconnect back as becoming relative to the downtown area; a more pedestrian, mixed use type of street, retail, etc. In addition to this, we will carry that street through the Capitol Mall area which is the case here. Then Woodland Neighborhood, rethinking that in terms of better bolstering the landscaping there and re-tree lining that. Then creating a reinvestment landscaping plan of the cemetery and reinvesting it back as a public space. These streets, 13th, 15th, 17th would be pedestrian connections down through the Capitol Mall area connecting the campus and ADOT back through the elementary school connecting University Park through the Woodland Neighborhood to the Carnegie Library for example. This is what the streetscape might look like if we rethink the plan. Everything that is in shadow is a parking structure; everything that is not is a surface structure. When I show you the buildings versus the ground parking which is really not the highest investment use in this area. Part of the intention here is to build more structures in like a sponge and absorb some of that surface parking and give it back as public space. In this case, we're proposing new structures, this existing structure between Adams and Washington currently has a portable canopy on top and in speaking with the City of Phoenix, we're proposing that all new parking structures become power sources for the city and that we put PV's on the tops of all those and tap that back into the grids. These are goals of let's say operating as an energy system but also as a public amenity for public parking and allowing for more connectivity. Here are the existing parks or should I say open spaces and this would be an enhancement of those. What we're proposing is a reforestation, not in the central access, keeping the view of the dome clear but a reforestation of this area's urban reforestation. Something similar to the Court House next to City Hall where it's a public realm, it's shaded, it's an Arizona space and it's more conducive to an arid and desert climate. The Carnegie is a very beautiful building with probably one of the best buildings in the entire city; and it has a very nice landscaping around it. I would just re-invest that and recognize that as a potential public space hopefully removing the fence from around it and make it more accessible. Here, thinking about how 13th, 15th, and 17th can suddenly become the natural connections between Carnegie Library, the Woodland Neighborhood and University Park. From an urban design standpoint this is really the infrastructure that allows this place to be reconnected to the city and allows for it to function. You park your car, you go to the library, walk to the park, park your car here and move to the Capitol area and allow this to be a

pedestrian campus. These are existing buildings, the parking structures are the dark gold color. The ones that don't have shadows are the ones that would be for the parking administration. These are buildings that they have on their list to be examined as to whether they are of the highest or best use, structurally sound or buildings worth keeping. So we use these as buildings that we might consider redeveloping. This is what the additional build form might look like starting from the east. Raising the height of buildings around here create more of a central park effect around the Carnegie Library and better frame it so that it really becomes the jewel around this lets say higher density urbanism. Also that would then frame the view down to the Capitol Mall and give you a very clear fine picture of the Mall via the corridor. This is where we think a density could occur. Now here, we're proposing that nothing except the executive tower is really higher than the dome itself. On Adam's Street what we're doing is we're showing dark yellow taller tower-like pieces then it steps down to the street. Adding retail loft housing above that then mediates between the single attached Woodland Neighborhood and a higher density urban condition on this side. Additionally we're planning new structures and reupholster those structures with additional office buildings that don't give you a parking structure on the street edge but give you a building on the street edge; it makes for a better city. In this scheme we're showing this is the original Senate and an expansion on the east and we'll go through those schemes in just a minute.

Dutton: Is that the only proposed new housing in the entire district?

Petrucci: Most of this is all governmental land so we not necessarily proposing new housing there but there are incredible opportunities in these other places for that housing to occur. We're proposing for it to happen along this edge because we believe that it is important to protect the Woodland Neighborhood. Here is a composite of all the systems and at this point I'll ask if there are any questions directly related to this master plan. These are some the larger issues that we're talking about, Connectivity: How do we connect people with the State Government and the Capitol Community - Through improved pedestrian networks, enhanced public amenities, more efficient transportation and greater accessibility to government services and district events. We're closing back here another parking structure to the Capitol Campus and thinking about how the Dash or other types of public buses would move through here to create a circuit around the Capitol Mall District. It's about three-hundred and sixty acres of what we're looking at.

Dutton: My question has to do with public transportation interfaced with the Dash with the Light Rail?

Petrucci: We're not really sure where the Light Rail is going. For things like that and other pieces, clearly the Light Rail will come down Washington and we could make that work. But we weren't presumptuous about proposing where it should go because politically that's a contested issue and we don't want to make the whole plan unhinged on the fact that Light Rail has to occur.

Calhoun: Excuse me, is there any commercial element to that or what is the closest commercial district, restaurants and things like that?

Petrucci: (To Gervais) Do you want to address some of that with the commercial issues?

Gervais: The whole Van Buren is ripe for redevelopment and Darren you can show them Grace Court. The private property is this area here is going through redevelopment, in fact

you'll see two buildings going up between next year's office, restaurant's and some retail as well. Then if you look in the other corner of the Capitol, on that corner on 7th avenue there's retail opportunities and then up along Van Buren and 19th Avenue that block which is privately owned, the owners want to do mixed projects retail, residential office complex. Those are projects that will rejuvenate this area. The Van Buren Corridor has a number businesses along there are very much favorable to doing retail business. As Darren mentioned the connection with Adams, the City of Phoenix is going through an Urban Forum project and so next year you're going to see a lot of plans come out of that. To the south you have the entertainment district; there may be some connection back to the city. From the entertainment district across 7th Avenue to North Adams their planning a restaurant and pedestrian oriented residential and retail on the street level and then carrying that across 7th Avenue. There are a number of opportunities in that area.

Wells: I just want to thank you for one thing especially; every single study that we have done for the Capitol Museum which is of course under the copper dome shows that the biggest problem that we have with tours, school children and anything is the fact that you can't see it because of all the monuments that have been put in front of it. There is a major public research library in this building and we would like people to find it. We're the only public law library in Arizona that takes public services as its primary goal and all of that is just perfect. The only thing that I would like to say about the Carnegie fence is that would please upgrade the general crime area of the neighborhood before you take down the fence because right now the fence is the only thing that is protecting it. The other reason is due to the building's heavy program usages for children right now. The children can come there and be safe. The children cannot dash out into the street.

Yoder: What is the vehicle access to Capitol Buildings, not normal parking but service vehicles, school buses?

Petrucci: Thank you for asking, what we're proposing here because we know that we will have school tours and other things happening; is removing the parking lots here and creating a little pull in right there and right there. Buses could pull in and drop off; the tours could walk to the Capitol Complex, through the memorial, etc. For people coming to the hearings and other types of stuff, they would park in the structure here, here and here and walk across the street and into it. There's also a structure we proposing back here. For the Legislatures, these two parking lots will remain and we would rethink them in terms of their landscaping and better foliage so that they would become apart of this larger Urban Reforestation. I hope that answers your question. About Sustainability: How do we create a sustainable urban development? As we think about the image of the State Capitol in the 21st century, especially in a place like Arizona's Arab region; how do we think about alternative ground surfaces that don't retain heat island temperatures. Our nighttime temperatures are now in the nineties now and this is an opportunity for us to start thinking about those. How do we shade public spaces like urban reforestation for these walkways that connect people. How do we increase the efficiency with these solar panels on the parking structures as another way of dealing with peak energy times throughout the city? There is no storage that we could tap back into the grid and go back to the power source for a reduced rate. Responsibility: Fulfill the municipal responsibility of the Capitol through Urban revitalization and better integration within the city. Promotion of the Capitol Mall District as the center for the state government. Increase the identity of the state leadership within the public realm. Opportunities for more efficient governance and communications. That gets to that issue of the responsibility of creating a functional assembly that legislature and the government agencies can function more

effectively. That brings us to the last part of Functionality Efficiency: Better utilization of space; advanced communication technologies; and easily navigable campus environments; how do people know that it is there. The last is feasibility and the point that I had made in the beginning is that this plan is pragmatic. We are very strategically finding places that we can find but not doing it in a hodgepodge. We will create centers that are unique and districts unto themselves will be in the larger district. Create connectivity between things that already exist and not propose for instance new parks but reinvest into the existing parks and pre-existing open spaces. This plan I think is very realizable with the forces and things that happen. Let me quickly kind of go through the three schemes. I'm going to show you three schemes for how we might expand the House and Senate. The first scheme is going to be this one up here. This is the Historic Capitol, the Executive Tower. Here we're proposing the possibility of a new building to the west. So in this case, historic, executive, building to the west, new chambers with the House and the Senate. This doubles the sizes and in this case we would remove these two buildings. Advantages to this, single entry and contained lobby between the executive and legislative branch. Disadvantage, legislative branch and the decision making pieces are in back if you will of the complex and are close to the executive tower not to the old capitol. It's nice in some ways having them up here and framing this building but also allowing them to be separate from the executive tower. Second scheme in the middle is where we keep the Historic Capitol here and then remove the two buildings in the front and flank it and then rethink it in terms of its circulation so that it becomes again a meeting place for the legislatures in the ground level and museum and things in the upper levels. New chambers on the east and west, House and Senate. A central entry in the Historic Capitol building and then a common meeting area is the yellow piece. Some of the disadvantages of this is the connectivity between these two are still bifurcated by the Historic Capitol building. Also the functions of this as a museum and library become potentially altered relative to the amount of public intersection within the building. Here we propose to bring the stairs back to allow for one kind of public access. In the third scheme which is the one you probably have seen in the newspaper, here we keep the original House and Senate and we re-scheme and add to them. We put a new wrapper around them expand them the east. 17th Avenue goes away because that's apart of our connective piece across the entire complex. Create a large depressed bar building that is the central lobby that connects these two and I'll show you that in a second. Then keep this building framed. This is similar to the capitol dome in Rome. When you walk into to the space regardless of whether you like it or not as it exist right now. You feel like your in a city, you don't feel like your in a country with large objects sitting on a landscape, you are in an outdoor room based on those two buildings. And that room a lot of business happens in that room. Keeping that as a framed room is actually a very positive aspect because it then frames the back to the city. So you both frame the Historic Capitol and you create this room and feel like you're a community in that space. Here what we're showing this a view from the Wesley Bolin Memorial. The ground starts to depress similarly to the ground at the Vietnam Memorial which is a low slope coming in. The building is this long glass of sod with entry in the middle. The chambers come down into those areas so there is where all of the public activities occur while still preserving the view of the Capitol. Then you can move through the building under than back up into the Capitol. So the relationship between the public space and these buildings is much more complex and more integrated with this scheme.

Gervais: This lobby area of the two Houses would face one another so that as you exit the Senate Chambers, you'd be looking into the House Chambers. You'd be joined by this grand lobby space area that could put out food court opportunities and I'd hate to give an analogy like a mall but there would be a place for people to gather and eat or have a cup of coffee in

between. This would be a great gathering space that you could come into from the east, the descending entry from Wesley Bolin Plaza, or from the west, from the original capitol building, you would go down the stairs and into the lobby area. One of the things we wanted to try to accomplish was to increase the opportunities for the two Houses of the legislature to interact.

Calhoun: Is there any possibility for an atrium of something that could bring in lights to that whole front piece?

Petrucci: This whole piece is open glass here and here all the way through. Effectively it's a canopy and it's all light all the way through so when you come down through these doors you'll see right through the building and the backside is all lit. This is depressed, the steps come back in taking you up and this is a lower court that comes down this way. Yes?

Driggs: Where do you find the function currently used by the lobbying tents which are an institution; and for as long as you can remember the tents go out there and that's where the lobbyists and lobbying groups convene. If you haven't thought of that and I'm sure you have because there has to be that kind of space; not in tents but possibly inside.

Gervais: The Senate and House lawn areas where they set up the tents, when they built those two buildings, those were not envisioned to be the tent space areas, Wesley Bolin Plaza was and it never occurred. Here we expand these buildings out again because they'll be over 17th Avenue which will eventually go away. This grand gathering space will be occurring at Wesley Bolin Plaza because now it will be shaded. It won't be parking lots for lobbyists to park and we're going to charge the lobbyists to park there. That's how we're going to get the money to pay for all of this but that's another story. Instead of having parking lots there, those would be the areas where we could have the gathering and meeting places for lobbying tents. Yes?

Jackson: How does the changing security environment affect each one of these designs?

Petrucci: That's a great question, a couple things; one 17th Avenue is no longer here so you're not going to be able to drive up close to the building. From a security standpoint we have a central security area now, there's not two. There is not one for one building and one for the other, there's one for both so anyone coming into building has to move through that central space. From a security standpoint for the legislators, the parking areas remain in the back where they can enter and exit the building if they need to in a more secure way. I hope that answers your question.

Jackson: Do you have any idea how much this is going to cost?

Petrucci: Six hundred million dollars.

Gervais: We're looking at three hundred dollars a square foot for this type of Class A office space improvement which also includes your interior improvements. Those are dollars that we are building with today. When you compare it to the costs of us building stadiums for that amount of money or something more important like our building of the convention center which has more than seven- eight hundred million dollars into it which is very important for the economy and the state. In comparison when you're building towers and office buildings, six hundred million dollars to do that is very reasonable. You're going to be looking at

something that is going to withstand a hundred years of time and would be the central point of Arizona.

Wells: I just wanted to know where you were when I was trying to explain it thirty five million years ago.

Driggs: You've given us three alternatives, what is the next step?

Gervais: What we've done with meeting with all of the leadership, the next step is to engage the executive branch which they put into their budget forty million dollars for the Centennial Capitol Project and we want to get the legislature involved so that we have some monies to plan and appropriate but first we want to get the plan approved and it may be a twenty-twenty five year plan. The first phase would be this Capitol Complex so that by the Centennial we open up the new Capitol Complex and we can accomplish that in five years but we need to get the legislature and the executive branch to adopt it.

Driggs: Can that be done in this session as far as triggering the money it is going to take over the next year?

Gervais: That's up to leadership, we would like to see it done sooner but if we could get the plan adopted by the legislative and the executive assemblies which the executive branch has indicated they would accept that plan.

Calhoun: I'm just curious as to whether you would consider this a symbolism of a phoenix rising from the ashes because you could almost envision this as you look at your designs.

Petrucci: No but that's a good reading. I'd like to make it clear that this is in no way architecture yet. It's really a massive study of how it would function. We haven't made any kinds of proposals in terms of how it's articulated. I think the next step is that we do a feasibility setting. We could look at whether to keep or save these two buildings. If it turns out that those buildings are not best safe; this might still be the right way to do it. Maybe we could separate them a little bit more but we'll still have two buildings there to help to frame the Historic Capitol. I do appreciate that interesting reading.

Driggs: This question was initiated by Speaker Flake and ASU as a student academic project that's gone quite a ways. When does it go from the university student project to a commercial architectural project?

Reiter: It's left the realm of being a student project at this point which is good. Director Petrucci as a team of professionals and close staff were driving it at the seam. It was descended by then Speaker Flake who said "Well, we don't see each other much, why can't we get together in terms of our physical circumstance down here. That led to a study that was picked up by the faculty and now led by Director Petrucci. Obviously we're not in the business of building businesses however it's necessary for us to get the ball rolling.

Gervais: These kinds of things are professional level work not student projects at this point.

Jackson: How much private or public money is mixed in the six hundred million; what would you guess that the public would contribute?

Driggs: It's all public money.

Jackson: I know that but how much would the legislature approve and how much would be raised by the public?

Calhoun: Do private dollars come into public buildings?

Petrucci: I think a contractor would probably agree with you once they got into the cost of the renovation equipment especially with health issues like that. The scheme that we're showing you right here works with new buildings in the same way that the similarities are there, the approach is there, the landscape is there and connectivity's are there.

Garrison: Okay, this is an update, we have approved this project and concept, I assume that as pieces of this become real you'll be back to have them officially designated as legacy pieces.

Gervais: Mr. Chairman, we would like to submit an application to designate it as a Centennial Legacy Project.

Garrison: Right.

Vershure: You'll have to fill out a form.

Gervais: I finally have the form so now we'll fill it out and submit it to you Mr. Chairman and GladysAnn.

Garrison: Great, I think this update shows us the maturity that is developing in the plan.

DISCUSSION/ACTION

Benefits of being a Legacy Project –

Catherine May brought this subject up because as she's been talking to people and encouraging them to submit legacy projects and also to the handing out of information with the dollars coming into that in and out fund. The question that she's run into most of the time is "what's in it for me"? If she's trying to sell this to her board or if she's trying to sell this to her city people, what does she say to them when they say why should we do this, why should we put dollars into the budget? She wants to be able to give them a reason and she thinks all of us should be able to say "Well here's what you automatically get as soon as you're involved in a legacy project". One thing that she did say is that they would go onto the Centennial website listed as one of the Legacy Projects with a hotline to their site. She thinks we need to officially lay out what it is that their getting. Do they get a certificate or do they get a letter of response back, you may have already thought through some of this.

Julie Yoder said the group has already taken action on this. The group approved the draft approval letter that goes out one action is taken on the application. They do get inclusion on the website list, they are included on the calendar of events and there is a possibility of funding which we still have to work out but on the agenda today in fact is the official certificate. They will receive a certificate once we decide what it will look like.

Partnership Definition

Catherine May said the Phoenix Area Office for the Bureau of Reclamation asked “Well how do we get to be a partner; as the initiating agency we’re listed as partners and how do we get to be a partner?”

John Driggs said he thinks that when we talk generally about organizations that would be supporting in different ways depending upon the nature of the organization and it seems to him that any recognizable organization that says I like the plan and the centennial idea we’d like to be a partner he thinks that all we have to do is say yes. In different ways we could suggest how they might be involved it isn’t like we have to vote them in. They will be in to whatever extent that they want to be involved because our plan and our charter is so broad that its certainly not meant to be exclusive, just wrap them all in.

Steve Rizley said that he wants to make sure that partner is identified and specified and not used as a euphemism for sponsor. Eventually as this thing really gets going, they may start calling it partnerships when what you may really want to do is get corporate sponsorships. Make sure the definition allows you to do that because he thinks COX could be involved in this if we put our name on it but he also think that there’s money to change for business entities that do that. That’s a little different than a government bureau which isn’t in the habit of writing checks to say how do we get involved and could we sponsor things that you’ll be doing. It seems like this isn’t a bad discussion and notwithstanding what John said, he thinks there is danger if a person or entity comes into this as a partner and what they really ought to be is a sponsor.

GladysAnn Wells said “Originally when we were developing the plan partners were those entities with historic content that wanted to make that content available for legacy purposes or were fostering some interaction with the professionals who deal with that content. That’s really kind of loose definition of the partners that are listed in the plan but what I think Steve said is very real. I think we really need to define what partnership is what is being a partner entails and what recognitions falls from that; and what sponsorships which will help us get the centennial done entails and what recognition falls from that. I’m not sure we should do it in the middle of a meeting but I think those are two very different entities and we owe it to people to be able to explain the difference.”

Action – Noel Stowe, Membership Vice Chair was assigned to find the difference between partnership and sponsorship.

Review Legacy Projects (some members have to leave early so this item was move up)

Julie Yoder informed the Commission that as of March 15th the Program, Projects and Events Committee has fifteen members and they still have a few more spots to fill, particularly from northern Arizona and tribal representatives. If anyone knows of any good candidates in those categories, please let her know.

The Program, Projects and Events Committee adopted a conflict of interest policy because some of the applications for legacy projects were coming to the groups where there were members of the committee. In that case anybody who’s is involved in the preparation of an application does not take part in the discussion and actually leaves the room for the voting

process. We've discussed member terms because one person who was invited to the committee said do I have to serve until 2012. We agreed that a system of rotating terms would probably be good. We need some continuity but we also need to bring new people on periodically and we'll work on that. There was a request that we add a line on the application form for a web address because the application is limited to three pages but if we had access to a website that would help the process. The tech people are working on that. It was also suggested that we keep a notebook of approved applications and we'll have that at the Humanities Council Office for the time being until we find another place to keep it. But if somebody wants to see what a successful application looks like, we have a sample. The rejected applications will not be in the samples.

The Program, Projects and Events Committee also talked about the committee's other responsibilities in addition to reviewing the legacy projects. Working to solicit more legacy projects helping with the implementation, so those will be things they will address in the future as well. The Program, Projects and Events Committee recommended approval of three projects. They turned one down (Arizona Centennial Trilogy, Art Renaissance Initiative – Michael Sarda) and have requested more information on Arizona 1912 and Arizona 2012 Volumes, Page (Allen Abel).

Noel Stowe stated: I raised this with Julie before we started and we have a proposal for the Arizona State Railroad Museum. There already is an Arizona Railway Museum in Chandler; and Chandler has spent several hundred thousand dollars on them. It seems to me that we ought to be somewhat sensitive when we approve something if somebody else with almost exactly the same name is in the process. Somebody ought to figure out what's going on here before we get into approving like legacy projects with almost the exact same name. I sit on a board with a representative of the Arizona Railway group in Chandler and I'm a public board member there. The thing that bothered me about this is they act like nobody else exists with almost exactly the same name. I don't have any problem with the project and I think it is a great idea but they ought to not be stealing somebody else's name I guess is my point. I don't want us to be accountable to the Arizona Railway Museum who's going to show up two months from now and say that we now have a legacy project; eventually we will all wonder who's who when we list all of these things. I don't know how to deal with this but it does seem to me that there is an issue here or something.

Steve Rizley stated "It sounds like their organized under different vehicle names as two different entitles. That would probably come pretty close to solving it; unless both of them do business as Arizona Railroad Museum."

Noel Stowe replied: "That's an interesting issue and the other one has been going for sometime. We just spent nine hundred thousand dollars of moving railroad track around so it's not an inconsequential thing that is going on in Chandler. At any rate, I do have a problem if somebody steals somebody else's name."

Julie Yoder said: I don't really see that this commission functions to sort out any problems; I mean there are other entities that take care of that. What we are doing is endorsing it as a legacy project; giving them the permission to use the logo of the official designation. If there is another group with a similar name so be it.

Motion: Julie Yoder motioned to accept the three Legacy Project recommendations from the Programs, Project and Events Committee. Ann Ewbank seconds the motion.

The motion passed to approve the Legacy Project recommendations from the Programs, Project and Events Committee.

Approved Legacy Projects:

**Brigham City, Arizona Territory
AZ State Railroad Museum
AZ Women's Heritage Trail**

Jim Garrison had some articles regarding the Arizona Centennial for the scrap book. GladysAnn said since everyone has different sources everyone could send them to Juanita for the notebook

Centennial Plan Brochure

Jim Garrison said it was the idea that we would not release the full plan published but lead people to the website for information. I brought this before even though it wasn't fully fleshed out. I got it fleshed out in time for the convocation and then when I was running over here from my office I didn't print it out in color but these photographs and things are in color. We're kind of looking at its content and layout. Obviously its mailable, all the things you would want with a tri-fold document summarizing what's there. John is using a one page handout that summarizes the plan elements in his work on fundraising. The question before us is this the type of document we would want to use to publicize that the plan has been adopted and released for the initial statement up here in the upper left or some other format?

Melodee Jackson said we should use this brochure (tri-folded document summarizing the Centennial Plan).

GladysAnn Wells agreed with Melodee Jackson.

Jim Garrison said "Okay, GladysAnn and I will do the final editing and I will get something to GladysAnn by the next meeting to hand out, is that fair?" (Members all agreed).

GladysAnn suggested Jim and Beth Vershure, Marketing Chairperson do it.

Action: GladysAnn Wells, Beth Vershure and Jim Garrison will edit the tri-folded Centennial brochure and have it ready for the next AHAC meeting

Pending Legislation

GladysAnn Wells informed the Commission that HB 2407 is going to come before the committee Tuesday morning. She said that some of us should be there to answer any questions that might come up.

John Driggs said he would be there.

GladysAnn Wells said SB1433 was amended with all the changes that we all asked of Senator Johnson. It has passed with the Senate but has not been scheduled for a hearing in the House. GladysAnn said she did not know if that means its prospects in the house are not good. She

said we owe Senator Johnson a thank you because she literally took every single request that the Commission sent to her in the summary. The way it reads right now is something that we very much needed as the number of members on this Commission is raised to twenty five. It mandates the Superintendent of Public Instruction and The Office of Tourism to be represented; which would be nice since we have not been able to get either of their attention terribly easily. It allows us to market certain things and allows us to have created medallions in gold, silver and copper which would be for minor fundraising. Senator Johnson indicated that only a small amount of profit can be made on those medallions but profit is profit

Administration/Treasurer Procedure – discussion in full

GladysAnn said that the last time we had the procedure in draft form was for the meeting that we weren't able to have (March 22, 2007). She said the whole Commission did not have an opportunity to look at the draft form.

Catherine May said that these are the handouts from the last time and are just here for approval.

Garrison: This question that you brought up about legacy project components, the related funding to those projects and the willingness of those entities to run their money through this account. I think that we are all answering that question to the best of our ability to say until we raise the five million we really can't say how the two and half million is going to be released. Does anybody have an idea about the willingness to do this? How that is really sold to the applicant?

Driggs: I do not quite understand the question.

Garrison: This idea that you're going to run your account through the State Treasurer and have that money available; how do we tell somebody that this is in fact doable and not risk their willingness to do it.

Driggs: I was going to address some of that just in my report; what we're really creating in this challenge match and that gets to the thrust of this meeting on the 19th. As our plan indicated anybody involved in fundraising knows that by and large contributors earmark and designate the object of their investment and contribution. Once we have the luxury of having some money coming in then we will be somewhat organizing the bank of The Library and Archives and how a particular contributor's account is earmarked as specified. If it happens to be a city that puts money in towards this match they may just say we don't what are legacy projects are going to be but we're putting money into the account knowing that in due time this will be applied to something that the Commission according to legislation says has to mesh with how contributed money is raised for particular purposes. As we start to add separate accounts for this city I hate to think of an organization could say the same thing. Arizona State University could say that we reserve the right for our investment in the Centennial but here it is because we want to put it towards this match. The fact that money can be spent as it's raised; we have to deal with that. We have to have the machinery again through the bank. All the money just sits in the treasury, all the accounting banking functions occur at the bank of Arizona Department of Library and Archives.

Stowe: I have a specific question and that is the coordinating committee for example is raising money on centennial activities. If we deposited that money in the treasury, as president I'd like the money back, I could put the money in as a count for doing some centennial activities that we've identified as specific centennial activities but I want the money back in a check so that we could spend it as we see fit. As a Commission member I am happy to say that that should be done. As president of the organization, it's like oh I don't know that I want to give the State of Arizona Treasurer the money because I want it back and I want to know that it's going to come back. That I think is difficult to talk to people about in this match; its one thing to say that we're building a match and we would like to get something back. CCHA would like to be able to say we don't necessarily want a match we just want to be helpful towards this huge amount. A big thing though is that the City of Chandler is going to propose that its museum be a legacy project and the vote is already approved eight and half million dollars in bonds. I'd like that to be seen as part of the match. Their not going to sell the bonds and put them in the State Treasury but the voters already voted those bonds and if it's an approved legacy project then my question is how do we get that to count. There are two different questions but their both passing through this account. My most immediate question is if we made a deposit with the treasurer and then the next month write the organization a check, could we get the money back and I don't know the answer to that question.

Wells: That question is yes because I believe and anyone can correct me if I'm wrong but my understanding from Treasurer Martin is that any money given to the State of Arizona for a specific purpose, that purpose is binding. Since it's clear in the legislation that we weren't suppose to get that money and hoard it because it's suppose to continue working. I mean legislative council would have to tell me it isn't true and they haven't said that yet. Mr. Tully, do you have any better instincts.

Tully: I think I am a little confused about what the goal of this organization with the money. If the legislature was to approve other people's projects and stick a stamp; is that all you plan on doing. Is there something that this group is going authorize because the problem with selling the two and half million is that there is nothing to sell. I could go and get APS and SRP to give half a million or go to Phillips Dodge. You could go to these folks and say that we're almost a hundred years old and were planning to have this big time thing; could you give us some money and the question is going to be, for what? Until there's a what from this organization is not going to raise money. ASU can raise money and the City of Phoenix can raise money but they've got a what. Unless there's a what there, I think your going to have trouble raising money or getting anybody to stick money into your account and run it through. That is my confusion as to what the goal is.

Wells: I guess my initial reaction is that it's both. As a Commission, we are going to simply evaluate our criteria against other people's projects and say go thou and do great work. I also think that the Commission's composition in the statute clearly tries to get the players across a broad spectrum together to figure out what collaboratively we could do. I think we've spent a lot of time doing the plan, developing the legacy criteria and now we're at a point where we could start to do that other thing; there are some real what's. The Arizona Memory is a real what, it's already here and we're all contributing to it. I don't think we've have that second really hard discussion about the various partners around this Commission deciding about what's going to be our signature set of projects. I don't think we've gotten there yet because it's taken a chunk of time to get to the criteria, the procedures and that sort of stuff.

May: Regarding the money, I have a couple of comments. Awhile back I recall John saying to me that the faster we can make this five million dollar match and demonstrate interest and momentum to the legislature the sooner we will be able go back in and start generating more funds. That in fact could be dollars going towards legacy projects or other projects. In the discussion with the folks that I was visiting; there was a coalition of people from throughout the valley. In that discussion they were perfectly willing to put money into the in and out to have their centennial dollars count towards the two point five million even though they might not get any of the two point five million. They didn't have a problem with helping us out as a way of moving forward. I'm not sure if we're going to get corporate Arizona to feel that way like the cultural institutions throughout the state that would be willing to do that. Then I also think we have another little bit of a definition problem and that is in some ways we're talking about legacy projects committing money or putting money into that in and out fund and getting it back out. CCHA on the other hand by me doing centennial work but we're not a legacy project. I could sort of see some complications with some of this terminology that we need to be clearer about. It really is starting to get complicated but those are all concerns or thoughts that I have as a result of actually being out in the field and encouraging people to give us money for no reason.

Vershure: I think the organic idea of this is that we would facilitate raising private funds to fund legacy projects but when we are faced with the notion of us raising five million dollars, that's a pretty awesome task to do for a Commission like this. One of the things that we went into is this notion of if you're a legacy project, you could put your money in and you would get this housekeeping seal of approval and then if we raise all that money you might actually get some money for your project too. In my best of both worlds we would go to the like candidates, The SRP, Cox or whoever it is and say we need to raise money in order to be able to fund legacy projects that this Commission deems worthy of a state of private investment and they would have to buy off on the fact that we're a kind of arbiter of what a legacy project is. I think it gets really complicated when we say, "Oh well railroad people would you like to put your five thousand dollars in here and we can't sign papers that you can get it back out". That whole thing is a little funky and weird to me.

May: At this point and if I may, the other thing that the SRP's and Cox's could do is take a chunk of change, stick it in the in and out fund and the dedicated balance of that we would use for any centennial stuff that their using, right?

Vershure: The concept in the fundraising world, as John probably knows, is it restricted funds or not? When you get money, but by God it's going to go to this project and that project.

May: The in and out fund is restricted but it still counts towards that five million.

Vershure: Correct.

May: Right now we're so focused on the five million ____.

Stowe: To go back to Steve's and GladysAnn's point that we have had discussions about what constitutes a really signature project or sub signature projects for the centennial and we haven't really gotten are hands around that. I think part of the problem is that we have money but that we really don't have money so how do you figure out what a signature project is. Some of the ideas that have come down the pipeline call for a big celebration to be a signature project. It could be for something to do on that day but to me a signature project that I'd like

to see get done is more of a legacy project that has enduring value. I think we're just kind of getting in to seeing some of those now. I'm a part of ASU and we're going to propose a digital project that's very large and we're trying to get our hands around how large it could be. It would be more of a legacy project that could be developed into what I would see as a signature because we're going to have a tremendous number of partners. I don't know if we've actually set a criterion for what a signature is and he raised the point about what we should be talking about now; what would be some signature projects that we would use. I think one of the issues that we've seen come forward is that some of the people want their projects done and their just big and their not necessarily statewide. We haven't determined whether a signature is large or whether it's actually less in compass of a huge portion of the state and I think that's an important question.

Jackson: I think one of the things that we wanted to do and it's only the case where you could do earmarking. It would be no problem to build enough to go to the credibility of the centennial. We also wanted to make sure that all of Arizona had a chance to participate and not just the major projects but a lot of the local museums. We wanted to focus on a lot of smaller festivals and stuff to where we could maybe fund some of those because not everything is a multimillion dollar project. We also think that there's going to be a lot of people who want to get involved in the centennial. This would be a good way of them to support an event they could feel comfortable with and we could direct it that way. There's something for everyone including those who want the money to come in and out. The more money that comes in and out I think it shows more state spirit and as more money is spent it shows that people really do care about Arizona and the history of Arizona. I think it is a perfect structure for everything.

Wells: The other part I'd add to that is that the dream grant that we've submitted to the Institute Museum of Library Services will be funded. We will have the capacity here for a perpetual institute to help smaller cities, towns, museums and so forth to learn how to do a product which is their history and to learn how to bring audiences and build sustainability. That heritage economic development institute concept that we were invited to apply for was built on some other work from Sharlot Hall and others. To me, this would be one the most important things this Commission would do and that application went under this Commission's name. It's this Commission through Library and Archives that applied for that and that would be a half of a million dollars. That would be something very real I think and I think that we have a good shot at it.

May: Last year at the Arizona History Convention, several members of this Commission met with the attendees. We heard loud and clear that we needed to start thinking about the big splash event and stuff; I think we did anyway when we were there. The developmental component of this Commission has really not taken hold and has not started to grow and root at all. In terms of development and the different types of fundraising of state project ideas, people are starting to want their itches scratched out there.

Tully: The idea is that it's going to be the main driver of the statewide centennial activities and clearing house for that because obviously all the cities and towns are going to do their own things. I don't know how the other states have run it; do we want to do a canvas of what everyone is planning? I think Mr. Rizley indicated that he knew something about how they did it in Oklahoma from the other people who were on that committee; did they do a catalog of projects that were collected statewide?

Stowe: Well yes but the problem that we've run into with other states is that they had a staff. One of hindering moments here is that we still have to raise the other two and half million but we also don't have a staff. This is a huge problem because we could approve projects but we really can't administer anything. When GladysAnn applies for something and it comes through the State Library, a major partner, then they could do it. The project that I'm proposing actually will be cited at ASU and we have a lot of partners in it but I have to figure out how to make it be there because I know there's not a staff here to do this. I think your question is right on for signature projects and they should do a lot of interesting things but I don't know how to do that without a staff.

May: We do have the statewide clearing house and the capability on their website to go there and see what they did for their centennial but again, there were developmental people on their staff because they had the money to do it. Hopefully with the fifty thousand that we are getting, we will be able to have a staff person who could start being the point person for it.

Garrison: One thing that might facilitate this discussion at the next meeting, we do have several state institutions and agencies represented around the table. I think it might be the moment where each of us explains potentially what are own agency is going to bring to the centennial because that's essentially at one level what's represented around the table especially the statutory members. State Parks is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary and getting their attention to the centennial still needs to be done. I think that maybe a reporting of what our individual institutions are thinking about in involving themselves in the centennial might lead us to how some partnerships might develop and what signature projects that the Commission could undertake. I don't think anyone of us has thought above our own institution as a collaborative effort to tell you the truth, yes?

Stowe: I think also what we have on the table is the question of not having the staff and if we're going to develop some of these things, how do you do that? I don't know how to do that personally but I think collectively we ought to look at the issue. If we don't have a staff, how do we do this? Fifty thousand dollars isn't going to produce a staff for one year.

Garrison: Right, I think we've talked about this topic and we've made progress but our list of things to do always get longer.

Wells: Mr. Chairman, maybe it would be good to consider our discussion at the next meeting, just put it on the agenda and take some time to talk through this.

Garrison: That's what I meant; I was suggesting that we start with what our individual institutions are doing and what we might be able to be collaboratively. I would make that an agenda item. Yes?

May: I would also like to request that to Noel's second point about there are things that are happening out there with bonds and how do we address that kind of stuff and is there a way that we could count that. There would be a couple of us that could get together to chat about that and report back.

Driggs: That issue was fundamental in the very discussion of the initial legislation. It was very clear in the whole appropriation concept that cities wouldn't be able to rush in and just drop down a bunch of bonds as match. Bonds authorized by cities for particular projects are off the table.

Stowe: But I'd like to put it back on the table John because I have a precise project if it gets approved as a legacy project. It's going to be real money and we're going to try to get it built in three years. It's not like we're putting up bonds that aren't going to go someplace, we're actually going to hire a director, doing plans and popping up floor space. It's not a pie in the sky notion and I have a thing to put on the table that says okay these aren't pie in the sky bonds. These are approved and if it's a legacy project then why not count it.

Driggs: My guess is that it won't count. If we want to repeat appropriation in which Steve and I discussed in the very beginning, it was very clear that we wanted this to be newly generated activity without trying to figure out how cities could use bond authorizations to do this. It's for future discussion but I think initially we shouldn't count on our five million coming from authorized voter bond issues from municipalities or counties.

➤ **Add above discussion to Agenda Item for Next Meeting:**

Programs, Projects, Events

Official Centennial Certificate

See section on **Benefits of being a Legacy Project** –

Julie Yoder said “They will receive a certificate once we decide what it will look like”.

COMMISSION MEMBERS REPORT:

Historic Sites Review (HSRC) – Don Ryden was not present to present report.

Countdown to the Centennial

Wells: The quarter update is that the mint has all five of the designs and if anyone has not seen the designs they are displayed in the State Capitol Museum on the third floor around the rotunda. You can actually see the designs and the mint is supposedly going to report back to the Quarter Commission. I believe the mint picks three of the five and then there's going to be a public web base kind of polling about which of the designs that the people of Arizona would like to see chosen. The quarter will be released in May 2008 and the Quarter Commission is very actively pursuing fundraising opportunities related to the quarter. One state actually had eight thousand little commemorative brochures that they sold and could have sold four times that many. The Quarter Commission is very hopeful that they will be able to raise between a hundred and two hundred fifty thousand dollars which they intend to give to the Arizona Historical Advisory Commission for the Centennial. That's the way that they believe the quarter will continue to be of use. Every other state that's done marketing around their quarter has been able to raise a significant amount of money. Wells Fargo has sort of been the bank de jour for most of the quarters in the west and they've have pledged their support of the Quarter Commission. We're hoping there wouldn't be a whole lot of cost recovery that would be necessary and that there would be simultaneous kinds of activities on the quarter release. The main one probably being here in Phoenix and I don't know if anyone has asked Ann yet but at either state park sites or at historical sites all around the state. Hopefully, everyone will kind of get into a buying frenzy around the quarter so that we would make two hundred and fifty thousand dollars of that match. The Quarter Commission has been absolutely stellar about helping the Centennial.

Development - Fundraising Initiative

Driggs: Let me tell you exactly how this meeting was initiated by the speaker. I happened to be testifying before the government committee; I think it was the day before Statehood Day. I simply appealed to the committee to authorize this memorial to go forth by just asking cities and elected officials to appoint committees and get organized. After that meeting the speaker who sits on the committee came down and he said "How's the match coming"? I said "Well, we're going to release the plan tomorrow and I'm working with our administrative people over at Library and Archives, figuring out how the accounts are going to be set up". Then the very next day I got a telephone call from one of his top people and he said that the speaker asked him to ask me to set in motion a meeting bringing in all the mayors from all over the state. This was initiated by the speaker but he of course meant to involve President Bee and he said that we want to talk to the mayors. In the process of getting it organized, the speaker chose the date and the invitation list was extended to the supervisors and heads of tribes so that there would truly be representatives of all entities. We envisioned about a two hour meeting in the heart of the day on the 19th, in the auditorium at the National Guard Headquarters who is hosting this. They have an auditorium that seat about two hundred and forty people. Perhaps there needs to be some members of the Commission there. I envisioned the possibility that we might create some displays in the rotunda. If you haven't been in the National Guard Headquarters, there's a beautiful rotunda that would be ideal for the State Historic Preservation Officer to put up a table or display. The Winslow Historical Society may want to project their project. If any of you would like to be on the program let me know because we have this limited time opportunity. Fortunately the Supervisor's Association is meeting here that same day and so we're going to have all the county supervisors who are kind of excited about being invited. How many mayors will show, I don't know. I talked to Hartman this morning and he said make sure you talk to the people in the intertribal council. The speaker wants a good meeting and it's his meeting. I don't know what he intends to say to them but his theme to them is that he wants this five million dollars raised quickly and he's going to put the pressure on the elected officials to think about how that could be done.

Garrison: This will be done in conjunction with a briefing on the Army National Guard?

Driggs: Yes because we're hosted there, it's a marvelous opportunity to have a setting in a historic national monument park. It will be opportunities for people to see a great museum that's effectively closed to the public. In fact I hope the Arizona Military Museum applies as a legacy project to get their facility opened to the public by 2012. That's doable it's just a security issue.

Garrison: But they're going to be able to see the Emergency Services Building?

Driggs: There will be a briefing by General Rataczak, the Commander of the National Guard on the guard's activity in Afghanistan and Iraq. The elected officials will be able to have conducted tours of the emergency operation center in Papago Park. Something that is certainly meaningful for elected officials to be aware of that anyway. We hope that we will have a good turnout with the cities and the Supervisor's Association is working very closely to see that it happens. The significant thing is that the speaker took the initiative and said I want to get this centennial thing launched.

Garrison: The real timeframe is 11-1p.m. which will include lunch.

Driggs: Yes and I think that everyone on the Commission ought to be there at least for that timeframe. I guess we don't have badges but may we could figure out some way to have some identification as Commission members. GladysAnn and Juanita maybe we ought to think about that.

Driggs: On the fundraising part, I am happy to report that after a series of meetings and I don't mind targeting them because we have some of their people right here. Catherine, I've met with the executive group of the Salt River project and I had subsequent meeting with the general manager and their governmental affairs person. They instructed me to write the letter requesting a significant contribution from SRP and I gave them the timetable. Their decision will be at their board meeting prior to April 19th. That's our first trial run; whatever fundraising that I've ever done, we always start with the big guys first and you see what you could do there. You saw Steve Gervais here from Pinnacle West; he asked me about how I've done with SRP and I gave him a copy of the letter that I wrote to John Williams. He'll be helping me draft a similar letter to another one of the big targets. We're just now at a point where we could start doing some significant fundraising.

Membership

Nothing was reported

Marketing

Beth Vershure said that on February 14, 2007 (Statehood Day) GladysAnn Wells and Jim Garrison were on HORIZON. KAET also ran little pieces all day on February 14th congratulating Arizona's Birthday

TREASURER REPORT

Catherine May said the only thing that I might add is that we are operating on the in and out account. We do get some interest from the state which is one month behind; I'm not sure how it's actually run

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No Public present (they all left after the Capitol Mall Update presentation)

FUTURE MEETING DATE

All Commission Members are to show up on April 19, 2007 at 10am at the AZ National Guard Headquarters Auditorium in Papago Park to launch the statewide effort to prepare for the Centennial in 2012.

After the April 19th launch a poll will be taken to determine May's meeting date.

FUTURE MEETING AGENDA ITEMS

- Reports from each Individual Institutions (what they are doing and what we can be done collaboratively towards the Centennial)
- Bonds – How do we address them?

CLOSING COMMENTS

Stowe: We also have two things for the Commission at the Arizona History Convention on April 28th. We have a 7a.m. breakfast meeting at the Arizona History Convention in Pine Top. We also have one May 24th and 25th.

Wells: Lets do the other meeting – we can do the May meeting in conjunction with the CCHA. The other thing that we have in April is that some of us are going to the Museum Association meeting to talk about the Centennial.

Garrison: Are we having a formal meeting on the 19th of April or are we just going to participate in this event.

Wells: Mr. Chairman, Library and Archives cannot handle a formal meeting on the 19th because that's the Library Association Legislative Day. I will not be able to attend anything else and we're backing that association up. If somebody else can do it that's fine but we can't.

Chairman Jim Garrison adjourned the meeting at 3:46pm

Respectfully Submitted

Juanita L. Cason
Arizona State Library, Archives and Public Records

MEETING HANDOUTS

- ❖ Agenda for March 22, 2007 meeting
- ❖ January 30, 2007 AHAC Meeting minutes
- ❖ March 8, 2007 Letter to Mayor Phil Gordon from Timothy S. Bee, Senate President and James P. Weiers, Speaker of the House
- ❖ Civic Tourism Institute paper
- ❖ ASU College of Design "Capitol Mall Centennial Plan" Revitalization & Redevelopment map
- ❖ Copy of AHAC Letterhead, Business Card and Envelopes
- ❖ January AHAC Treasurer Report
- ❖ February AHAC Treasurer Report
- ❖ Arizona Centennial Plan Brochure